UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,311	08/30/2001	Takahiko Hasegawa	FY.17226US0A	2052

20995 7590 08/27/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, LAURA B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3616	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/945,311	HASEGAWA, TAKAHIKO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laura B Rosenberg	3616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *10-12* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,13-27,29 and 30-34* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *28 and 35* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *19 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4,6,7,10,11*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 10-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 9.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements filed August 22, 2002, June 2, 2003, and July 21, 2003 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because they do not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. They have been placed in the application file, but each reference with a line through it has not been considered. Further, the examiner has amended the foreign patent documents cited on the information disclosure statement filed on February 20, 2002 so that the document numbers more accurately reflect the documents being cited. Specifically, the country code (JP) was added to Document No. 09207706 and DE 098 21 134 A1 was changed to DE 198 21 134 A1.

Drawings

4. The drawings were received on December 19, 2001. These drawings are acceptable.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

reference character "72" should be used to identify the "vibration detection circuit" instead of reference character "78" (paragraph 0107,.line 5),

reference character "74" should be used to identify the "capacitor circuit" instead of reference character "78" (paragraph 0107, line 5).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: "EEPROM" (claim 24, line 2) should be written in its entirety the firs time it is presented in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3 and 6 recite the limitation "said output" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,033,428) in view of Dodd et al. (3,772,643), further in view of Fritz (3,882,957). In regards to claim 1, Sasaki discloses a wheeled vehicle (inherent; column 1, lines 9-11) comprising a motive member (#100), a control unit (#1, 700), electrically connected to the motive member (best seen in figure 1), and an accelerometer (#15, 800) electrically communicating with the control unit (best seen in figures 1, 2). The accelerometer is adapted to output a signal that varies with a leaning angle of the vehicle (column 2, line 65-column 3, line 2), the control unit is adapted to compare the signal to a threshold signal indicative of a fall angle (column 3, lines 26-32), and the control unit is further adapted to disable the motive member if the signal exceeds the threshold signal (column 3, lines 32-45). Although conventional in the art, Sasaki does not specifically disclose that the wheeled vehicle comprises a frame, a front wheel steerably attached to the frame, a rear wheel attached to the frame, or the motive member mounted to the frame and connected to at least one of the front wheel

and the rear wheel. Dodd et al. teach a wheeled vehicle (#A) comprising a frame, a front wheel steerably attached to the frame, a rear wheel attached to the frame, and a motive member mounted to the frame and connected to at least one of the front wheel and the rear wheel (best seen in figure 1). A tilt actuated device (#D) varies with the leaning angle of the vehicle and the vehicle is disabled by opening of the ignition system when the leaning angle reaches a certain threshold for a specific period of time (column 4, lines 8-31). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the wheeled vehicle of Sasaki such that it comprised a frame, wheels, and connections as claimed in view of the teachings of Dodd et al. so as to provide a tilt-actuated safety device for vehicles and other motor-driven equipment which may be subjected to canting or tilting to a hazardous degree (Dodd et al.: column 1, lines 11-17). Further, Sasaki does not disclose the control unit comprising an outer housing and the accelerometer mounted within the outer housing. Fritz teaches a wheeled vehicle comprising a motive member (within compartment #12), a control unit (#35) electrically connected to the motive member and comprising an outer housing (#13, 80), and a tilt switch (#55) mounted within the outer housing (column 3, lines 4-8) and electrically communicating with the control unit (best seen in figure 2), the title switch varying with a leaning angle of the vehicle and the control unit disabling the motive member (via fuel cutoff #57 and electrical cutoff #58) if the leaning angle exceeds a threshold angle (column 3, lines 54-66). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the control unit of Sasaki such that it comprised an outer housing with the accelerometer mounted within

the outer housing as claimed in view of the teachings of Fritz so as to provide the convenience of mounting all of the components of the fuel and electrical cutoff means within the same housing (Fritz: column 3, lines 16-18).

In regards to claim 2, Sasaki does not specifically disclose the orientation of the accelerometer. Fritz teaches the tilt switch (#55) mounted generally horizontally (best seen in figure 2). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Sasaki such that it comprised a generally horizontal mounting as claimed in view of the teachings of Fritz so as to easily measure the tilt angle (Fritz: column 3, line 63-column 4, line 3).

11. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,033,428) in view of Dodd et al. (3,772,643), further in view of Fritz (3,882,957), and further in view of Schiffmann (6,192,305). In regards to claim 3, Sasaki does not disclose a formula used to determine the variation of the signal in relation to the leaning angle. Schiffmann teach a wheeled vehicle comprising a control unit (#22) and accelerometers (#12-20) electrically communicating with the control unit (column 5, lines 3-4). The accelerometers output a signal that varies as a mathematical sine of a leaning angle (current roll angle Φ; column 7, lines 7-33). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Sasaki such that it comprised a signal that varies as a mathematical sine of the leaning angle as claimed in view of the teachings of Schiffmann so as to

provide a reliable, low-cost rollover sensor that more accurately predicts an overturn condition of a vehicle (Schiffmann: column 1, lines 54-67).

12. Claims 4, 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blosch (6,428,118) in view of Fritz (3,882,957). In regards to claims 4 and 7, Blosch discloses a wheeled vehicle (best seen in figure 3) comprising a frame (#3), a front wheel (#1) steerably attached to the frame, a rear wheel (#1) attached to the frame, a motive member (#105) mounted to the frame and connected to at least one of the front wheel and the rear wheel (not shown), a control unit (#104, 104a, 104b) electrically connected to the motive member (column 5, lines 50-52), and an accelerometer (#101-103) electrically communicating with the control unit (column 4, lines 26-37, 49-67). The accelerometer is adapted to output a signal that varies with a rate of forward deceleration or acceleration (column 4, lines 26-31; acceleration and deceleration being measured in the same way), the control unit is adapted to compare the signal to a collision or wheelie threshold signal (column 5, lines 2-17; column 5, line 66-column 6, line 7), and the control unit is further adapted to reduce the output of, and in turn disable the motive member if the signal exceeds the threshold signal (column 5, lines 58-65). Blosch does not disclose the control unit comprising an outer housing and the accelerometer mounted within the outer housing. Fritz teaches a wheeled vehicle comprising a motive member (within compartment #12), a control unit (#35) electrically connected to the motive member and comprising an outer housing (#13), and all of the components of a fuel and electrical cutoff means mounted within the outer housing

(column 3, lines 16-18; best seen in figures 1, 2). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the control unit of Blosch such that it comprised an outer housing with an accelerometer mounted within the outer housing as claimed in view of the teachings of Fritz so as to provide the convenience of mounting all of the components of the fuel and electrical cutoff means within the same housing (Fritz: column 3, lines 16-18).

In regards to claims 5 and 8, Blosch discloses the accelerometer (#101-103) mounted generally horizontally (best seen in figures 1, 3).

13. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blosch (6,428,118) in view of Fritz (3,882,957), further in view of Carlson et al. (6,417,767). In regards to claims 6 and 9, Blosch does not disclose a formula used to determine the variation of the signal in relation to the pitching angle. Carlson et al. teach a wheeled vehicle (#24) comprising a control unit (#20) and an accelerometer (#16) electrically communicating with the control unit (best seen in figure 1). The accelerometer outputs a signal that varies with the rate of forward deceleration or acceleration, the control unit comparing the signal to a threshold signal (column 4, lines 19-22) and initiating a warning indicator (#14) to indicate an urgent deceleration or acceleration condition. The signal varies as a mathematical sine of the pitching angle of the vehicle cased by rapid deceleration (column 4, lines 27-35, 46-59; column 5, lines 24-36). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Blosch such that it comprised a signal that

varies as a mathematical sine of the pitching angle as claimed in view of the teachings of Carlson et al. so as to provide a sensor system that is less prone to false triggering because the acceleration and deceleration values are corrected for gravitational forces acting on the vehicle (Carlson et al.: column 1, line 65-column 2, line 3).

14. Claims 13, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,033,428) in view of Saito et al. (5,758,301). In regards to claim 13, Sasaki discloses a method of controlling operations of a vehicle during an accident, the vehicle having an electronic control unit (#1, 700) that comprises a control circuit (best seen in figure 2 within dashed lines) that is in electrical communication with an accelerometer (#15, 800), the electronic control unit adapted to control operation of a motive member (#100) and a fuel pump (#18, 300). The method comprises sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, then disabling the motive member (column 3, lines 26-36). Sasaki does not disclose that the accelerometer is a semiconductor accelerometer. Saito et al. teach a method of controlling operations of a vehicle during an accident, the vehicle having a semiconductor accelerometer (#10), and the method comprising sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, then operating an occupant restraint system (column 1, line 66-column 2, line 10). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the

accelerometer of Sasaki such that it comprised a semiconductor as claimed in view of the teachings of Saito et al. so as to accurately detect acceleration/deceleration in the event of an accident. Further, the examiner notes that in the absence of justification for the need for a semiconductor-type accelerometer instead of another type of accelerometer, the use of an equivalent accelerometer, such as that disclosed in the Sasaki reference, would have been an obvious modification.

In regards to claim 20, Sasaki discloses the motive member being disabled by interruption of ignition (#13, 900.

In regards to claim 21, Sasaki discloses the motive member being disabled by interruption of fuel injection (#18, 300).

15. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,033,428) in view of Saito et al. (5,758,301), further in view of Reginold (4,856,613). In regards to claims 14 and 17, Sasaki discloses disabling a fuel pump (#18, 300) associated with a motive member (#100) if an output signal exceeds a preset threshold level. Sasaki does not disclose a preset period of time. Reginold teaches a method of controlling operations of a vehicle (#5) during an accident, the vehicle having an accelerometer (#40), and the method comprising sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, disabling a motive member (#11; column 3, lines 61-66). The motive member is only disabled if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level for a preset period of time (#34; column 3, lines 35-

43). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Sasaki such that it comprised a preset period of time as claimed in view of the teachings of Reginold so as to prevent disabling of the motive member when excessive acceleration/deceleration or tilt is present for only a short period of time, thus indicating that an unsafe driving condition is either not present or has already been corrected.

In regards to claims 15 and 16, Sasaki discloses the output signal being indicative of a leaning angle of the vehicle (column 2, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 26-29), the preset threshold level generally corresponding to a non-recoverable lean angle.

16. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,033,428) in view of Saito et al. (5,758,301), further in view of Reginold (4,856,613), further in view of Carlson et al. (6,417,767). In regards to claims 18 and 19, Sasaki does not disclose the output signal being indicative of a deceleration rate with the preset threshold level corresponding to a rate of acceleration. Carlson et al. teach a method of controlling operations of a vehicle (#24) during an accident, the vehicle having an electronic control unit (#20) and an accelerometer (#16) electrically communicating with the control unit (best seen in figure 1), and the method comprising sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold, then sending out a warning signal (column 3, lines 39-46). The accelerometer outputs a signal that is indicative of a deceleration/acceleration rate of the vehicle (column 4, lines

2-7) and the preset threshold level generally corresponds to a rate of deceleration/acceleration greater than that encountered during a panic braking operation (column 5, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Sasaki such that it comprised an output signal indicative of a deceleration rate and a corresponding preset threshold level as claimed in view of the teachings of Carlson et al. so as to provide a sensor system that indicates when excessive acceleration or deceleration, and thus an unsafe driving condition, is occurring (Carlson et al.: column 3, lines 32-52).

17. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (5,033,428) in view of Saito et al. (5,758,301), further in view of Schiffmann (6,192,305). In regards to claims 22-24, Sasaki does not disclose the use of a correction reading or an electrically erasable programmable read-only memory (EEPROM). Schiffmann teaches a method of controlling operations of a vehicle during an accident, the vehicle having an electronic control unit (#22) and accelerometers (#12-20) electrically communicating with the control unit (column 5, lines 3-4), the method comprising sensing an output signal from the accelerometers, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, then providing a signal indicating a vehicle overturn condition (column 2, lines 16-26). Associated with the electronic control unit is an EEPROM (#24) that stores various programmed calibrations for performing the rollover sensing algorithm (column 4, lines 54-59). Although not specifically disclosed, it is old and well known in the art

that the process of calibrating any system for an apparatus involves placing the system in test mode, placing the apparatus in a neutral state or position, obtaining a corrected reading for the apparatus, storing the corrected reading, and adjusting a current reading based on the calibrated corrected reading. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the method of controlling operations of a vehicle during an accident of Sasaki such that it comprised an EEPROM and test mode as claimed in view of the teachings of Schiffmann so as to store calibration values for accurately determining if/when a vehicle rollover will occur (Schiffmann: column 4, lines 54-58).

18. Claims 25, 29, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blosch (6,428,118) in view of Saito et al. (5,758,301). In regards to claim 25, Blosch discloses a method of controlling operations of a vehicle (#3) during acceleration, the vehicle having an electronic control unit (#104, 104a, 104b) that comprises a control circuit (best seen in figure 4) that is in electrical communication with an accelerometer (#101-103), the electronic control unit adapted to control operation of a motive member (column 5, lines 50-52). The method comprises sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, then decreasing an output of the motive member (column 4, lines 26-37; column 5, lines 50-65). Blosch does not disclose that the accelerometer is a semiconductor accelerometer. Saito et al. teach a method of controlling operations of a vehicle during acceleration, the vehicle having a

semiconductor accelerometer (#10), and the method comprising sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, then operating an occupant restraint system (column 1, line 66-column 2, line 10). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Blosch such that it comprised a semiconductor as claimed in view of the teachings of Saito et al. so as to accurately produce an accelerometer signal representing the acceleration/deceleration of the vehicle (Saito et al.: column 2, lines 44-45). Further, the examiner notes that in the absence of justification for the need for a semiconductor-type accelerometer instead of another type of accelerometer, the use of an equivalent accelerometer, such as that disclosed in the Blosch reference, would have been an obvious modification.

In regards to claims 29 and 30, Blosch discloses the motive member (#105) being an internal combustion engine (not shown) and decreasing an output of the motive member comprising selectively interrupting ignition (#16) and/or fuel injection (#15) of the engine (column 4, lines 65-67).

19. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blosch (6,428,118) in view of Saito et al. (5,758,301), further in view of Reginold (4,856,613). In regards to claim 26, Blosch discloses decreasing the output of the motive member only if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold. Blosch does not disclose a preset period of time. Reginold teaches a method of controlling operations of

a vehicle (#5) during acceleration, the vehicle having an accelerometer (#40), and the method comprising sensing an output signal from the accelerometer, comparing the output signal with a preset threshold level, and if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level, decreasing an output of a motive member (#11; column 3, lines 61-66). The output of the motive member is only decreased if the output signal exceeds the preset threshold level for a preset period of time (#34; column 3, lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the accelerometer of Blosch such that it comprised a preset period of time as claimed in view of the teachings of Reginold so as to prevent decreasing of the output of the motive member when excessive acceleration/deceleration is present for only a short period of time, thus indicating that an unsafe driving condition is either not present or has already been corrected.

In regards to claim 27, Blosch discloses a throttle actuator (#14) being affected by the output signal of the accelerometer (column 4, line 66). Blosch does not disclose sensing a throttle position and comparing the position to a preset throttle angle. Reginold teaches sensing a throttle position (via #40), comparing the sensed throttle position to a preset throttle angle, and decreasing output of the motive member (#11) only if the output signal from the accelerometer exceeds the preset threshold level and the sensed throttle position is greater than the preset throttle angle (column 3, lines 61-66). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the method of controlling operation of a vehicle during acceleration of Blosch such that it comprised a sensing of throttle position as claimed in view of the

teachings of Reginold so as to effect change on the motive member when excessive load or acceleration of the engine is sensed over a predetermined period of time (Reginold: column 2, lines 10-13).

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claims 28 and 35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

21. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the allowable subject matter in claim 28 is decreasing the output from the motive member only if the output signal from the accelerometer exceeds the preset threshold level, the sensed throttle position is greater than the preset throttle angle, and the sensed vehicle speed is less than the threshold speed; the allowable subject matter in claim 35 is the stepped down output of the motive member with the output being returned to normal in a series of increments.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. English et al., Engel, Renk, Springer, Courtot, Williams, Scieur, Smith et al., Ohkumo, Minks, Kerns et al., Rank et al., Darby et al., Klarer, and McConnell disclose an engine cut-off switch and/or tilt or acceleration sensor(s).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura B Rosenberg whose telephone number is (703) 305-3135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, alternating Fridays 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on (703) 308-2089. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Laura B. Rosenberg

LBR

8/20/03

PAUL N. DICKSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600